

### **Remarks**

Claims 1-10 are pending in this application. For the reasons and arguments set forth below, Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed invention is allowable over the cited references.

The non-final Office Action dated March 28, 2007 indicated an objection to the Abstract, an objection to claim 2, and listed the following rejections: claims 8-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, claims 1, 2, 6-8 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Lu (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0131864), and claims 1-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Mehringer et al. (U.S. Pat. 5,333,627) in view of Harlan et al. (U.S. Pat. 5,289,835).

Regarding the objection to the Abstract, Applicant has provided a copy of the Abstract on a separate sheet as indicated on page 2 of this paper. Therefore, Applicant requests that the objection to the Abstract be removed.

Regarding, the objection to claim 2, Applicant has amended the claim as indicated on page 3 of this paper. Thus, Applicant requests that the objection to claim 2 be removed.

Regarding the Section 112(2) rejection of claims 8-10, Applicant has amended these claims to clarify that they are directed to a container. As such, Applicant submits that the Section 112(2) rejection of claims 8-10 is improper and requests that it be withdrawn.

Applicant respectfully traverses the Section 102(e) rejection of claims 1, 2, 6-8 and 10 because the cited portions of the Lu reference fail to correspond to all of the claimed limitations. Regarding claims 1 and 8, the cited portions of the Lu reference do not correspond to claimed limitations directed to the surface of the base part having a depression which collects residual additive that is expelled through the additive outlets. The Office Action fails to cite to any portion of the Lu reference as corresponding to the depression of the claimed invention. Moreover, the cited portions of the Lu reference do not teach that body member 6, on which apertures 10 and teeth 17 are disposed, has a depression on its surface as in the claimed invention. *See, e.g.*, Figures 1 and 8-10; Paragraphs 0044 and 0048-0049. Accordingly, the Section 102(e) rejection of claims 1 and 8, as well as the rejection of claims 2, 6-7 and 10 that depend from claims 1 or 8, is improper and Applicant requests that it be withdrawn.


Applicant respectfully traverses the Section 103(a) rejection of claims 1-10 because the cited portions of the references fail to correspond to all of the claim limitations. Regarding claims 1 and 8, the cited portions of the Mehringer and Harlan references do not correspond to claim limitations directed to the surface of the base part having a depression which collects residual additive that is expelled through the additive outlets. The Office Action fails to cite to any portion of the Mehringer reference or to any portion of the Harlan reference as corresponding to the depression of the claimed invention. Moreover, the Mehringer reference does not teach that the dispenser head 2 has a depression on its surface. *See, e.g.*, Figures 1 and 4; Col. 3:49 to Col. 4:3. In addition, the Harlan reference also does not teach that the brush head 25 has a depression on its surface as in the claimed invention. *See, e.g.*, Figures 5 and 9; Col. 4:9-53.

Moreover, regarding claims 2 and 8, the cited portions of the Mehringer and Harlan references do not correspond to the claim limitations directed to the container being detachable from the electric device. The cited portions of the Mehringer reference do not teach that the container 3 can be detached from the syringe 1. *See, e.g.*, Figures 1 and 4; Col. 3:35 to Col. 4:13. The cited portions of the Harlan reference also do not teach that the tube 20 can be detached from the hair coloring brush depicted in Figure 5. *See, e.g.*, Figure 5; Col. 4:22-24. In view of the above, the Section 103(a) rejection of claims 1 and 10, as well as the rejection of claims 2-7 and 9-10 that depend from claims 1 or 8, is improper and Applicant requests that it be withdrawn.

In view of the remarks above, Applicant believes that each of the rejections has been overcome and the application is in condition for allowance. Should there be any remaining issues that could be readily addressed over the telephone, the Examiner is asked to contact the attorney overseeing the application file, Adam Stroud, of Philips Corporation at (408) 904-3618.

*Please direct all correspondence to:*

Corporate Patent Counsel  
Philips Intellectual Property & Standards  
370 West Trimble Road, MS91MG  
San Jose, CA 95131

By:   
Name: Robert J. Crawford  
Reg. No.: 32,122  
(VLSI.602PA)

CUSTOMER NO. 24738